

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

BROCK FREDIN,

Plaintiff,

--against--

GRACE ELIZABETH MILLER,
CATHERINE SCHAEFER,
LINDSEY MIDDLECAMP,
DAVID MIDDLECAMP,
PETER MAYER,
DAVID GREEN,
DORSEY AND WHITNEY

Case No. 19-CV-3051

Defendants.

STATE OF WISCONSIN }
 ss:
COUNTY OF SAINT CROIX }

BROCK FREDIN, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. I am the Plaintiff in the above-captioned proceeding. I submit this declaration in support of my motion to disqualify Karl Johann Breyer filed on February 12, 2020. For the reasons stated herein and within my memorandum of law dated February 12, 2020 Karl Johann Breyer (“Attorney Breyer”) should be disqualified and this motion should be granted in its entirety.

2. Attorney Breyer was counsel of record in several state court cases in Wisconsin and Minnesota representing Defendant Catherine Schaefer and Lindsey Middlecamp:

- *Middlecamp v. Fredin*, Ramsey County, Case No. 62-HR-CV-19-621

- *Fredin v. Schaefer, Saint Croix County Circuit Court, Case No. 2018CV000190*

3. Attorney Breyer was counsel of record in several actions in the District Court of Minnesota:

- *Fredin v. Middlecamp*, Case No. 17-CV-3058,
- *Fredin v. Miller*, Case No. 18-CV-466,
- *Fredin v. Clysdale*, Case No. 18-CV-510
- *Fredin v. Street*, Case No. 19-CV-2864

AUTHENTICATION OF DOCUMENTS

4. Attached hereto as **Exhibit A** is a true and correct copy of an April 25, 2017 email captioned New documentation of suspected criminal violation of restraining order by bRock Fredin between David McCabe, Sarah Nasset, Peter Mayer, Catherine Schaefer, Grace Miller, Karl Johann Breyer, and Adam C. Ballinger.

5. Attached hereto as **Exhibit B** is a true and correct copy a February 11, 2020 email response sent to Brock Fredin.

6. Attached hereto as **Exhibit C** is a true and correct copy a docket in *Fredin v. Schaefer*, Saint Croix County Circuit Court, Case No. 2018CV000190.

7. Attached hereto as **Exhibit D** is a true and correct copy April 21, 2017 emails between Lindsey Middlecamp and David McCabe captioned Current address for Brock Fredin.

8. Attached hereto as **Exhibit E** is a true and correct copy April 21, 2017 emails between Grace Miller and David McCabe captioned more posts.

9. Attached hereto as **Exhibit F** is a true and correct copy February 21, 2018 emails between David McCabe and Steve Christie captioned Brock Fredin stalking trial date: May 14.

10. Attached hereto as **Exhibit G** is a true and correct copy various documents contained in the February 12, 2020 FOIA production.

Attorney Breyer's April 25, 2018 Email
to the Saint Paul Police Department
Triggering Rule 3.6 (Lawyers as a Witness) Disqualification

11. On April 28, 2018 Attorney Breyer coordinated an email captioned “new documentation of suspected criminal violation of restraining order by Brock Fredin” (“April 25 Email”). This is attached hereto as **EXHIBIT A**. The email was sent to primary recipients Saint Paul Police Officers David McCabe and Sarah Nasset. The email contained carbon copy (cc) recipients mayer.peter@dorsey.com, Catherine Schaefer, Grace Miller, Breyer, Jon, Ballinger, Adam C. The names for “Catherine Schaefer, Grace Miller, Breyer, Jon, and Ballinger, Adam C” were auto promulgated by Microsoft Outlook meaning that prior email contact existed between Saint Paul Police officers Mr. McCabe and Ms. Nasset to Catherine Schaefer, Grace Miller, Jon Breyer, and Adam C. Ballinger. Moreover, the name for Defendant Peter R. Mayer was not promulgated and his direct email address displayed as mayer.peter@dorsey.com. Microsoft Outlook only displays names in this manner when prior contact existed or did not exist:

From:	Lindsey Middlecamp <lindsey.e.middlecamp@gmail.com>
Sent:	Wednesday, April 25, 2018 11:38 AM
To:	McCabe, David (CI-StPaul);Nasset, Sarah (CI-StPaul)
Cc:	mayer.peter@dorsey.com;Catherine Schaefer;Grace Miller;Breyer, Jon;Ballinger, Adam C.
Subject:	New documentation of suspected criminal violation of restraining order by Brock Fredin

(See February 12, 2020 Pl. Decl Ex. A ¶ at 1.) The auto naming conclusively evidences Attorney Breyer’s previous communication to Saint Paul Police Officer David McCabe and Sarah Nasset.

The email contained statements admitting to fabricating allegations contained in a Saint Paul police report captioned with a case number 1728017 originally filed on December 21, 2017. Specifically, the email stated: “while [Defendant Schaefer] was waiting for “Kelli” to respond, Lindsey Middlecamp and Catherine Schaefer discussed strategies for determining and proving whether this anonymous messenger was in fact Brock or someone acting on Brock’s behalf. (Previously, someone who had contacted Catherine indicated they had been paid \$40 by someone else to relay her a message; we suspected if “Kelli” was a real person at all, this might have been a similar circumstance.)“ *Id ¶* at 3 The two agreed that if Catherine provided Brock with unique false information he might later include it in a court filing and they would be able to track it to this message exchange. They brainstormed and decided the most believable false information to provide that Brock would be most likely to raise in a legal proceeding ... Catherine sent a message to that effect on October 3, 2017 ... nothing came of it until today (April 25, 2018) ... [when] Brock affirmatively published a redacted screenshot of the same message Catherine sent “Kelli.” Catherine and Lindsey are the only other people in possession of that message and have never disclosed it to anyone, posted it publicly, or used it in any filings.” *Id ¶* at 3 Defendant Lindsey Middlecamp, Catherine Schaefer and Attorney Breyer were unequivocally committing fraud and attempting to use this Court’s April 8, 2018 letter in *Fredin v. Miller*, Case No. 18-CV-466 as proof to bring frivolous criminal charges abusing process to thwart civil litigation. *Id ¶* at 1-3

12. As described above, the April 25 Email coordinated by Attorney Breyer included his full name – without citing his email address - illustrative of previous contact to Saint Paul Police Sergeant David McCabe and Sarah Nasset. The email further contained statements admitting that Defendants including Attorney Breyer fabricated activities by providing “unique false information [Plaintiff] might later include it in a court filing and they would be able to track

it to this message exchange. [Defendant Middlecamp and Schaefer] brainstormed and decided the most believable false information to provide that Brock would be most likely to raise in a legal proceeding would be to fabricate that Lindsey ...”

~~The two agreed that if Catherine provided Brock with unique false information he might later include it in a court filing and they would be able to track it to this message exchange. They brainstormed and decided the most believable false information to provide that Brock would be most likely to raise in a legal proceeding would be to fabricate that Lindsey~~

Id ¶ at 1-3 The April 25 Email was sent following the April 8, 2018 (“April 8 Email”) letter sent by Plaintiff in *Fredin v. Miller*, Case No. 18-CV-466. [Doc 16] Plaintiff believes the reason that Attorney Breyer coordinated the April 25 Email was to coverup allegations contained in the April 8 Email. The April 25 Email nevertheless evidences Attorney Breyer, Ballinger, Defendant Peter R. Mayer, and Defendants collusion and third-party communication to fabricate evidence and commit fraud on this Court, and most importantly, use this Court as fodder for their continued state court fabrications. This violates Minn. R. Prof. Cond. Rule 1.6 and 3.3. It still remains surprising that Defendants have not been charged with false police reporting, assault, obstruction, or tampering.

13. Attorney Breyer will now be called as a witness to identify the April 25 Email at trial or through any pleading stages. This triggers Minn. R. Prof. Cond. Rule 3.7 (Attorneys as a Witness) disqualification.

Attorney Breyer’s Attorney Mediator Violation

14. Upon information and belief, Attorney Breyer was a partner with Lindquist and Vennum/Ballard Spahr from at least January 2016 up until the first quarter of 2018. In early 2018, Attorney Breyer took a different position as a non-equity Of Counsel at Kutak Rock.

15. A party admission was made identifying Lindquist and Vennum/Ballard Spahr’s mediation during the state court action originally filed in Ramsey County District Court captioned

Schaefer v. Fredin, Case No. 62-HR-CV-16-411 (“*Schaefer v. Fredin*”). The party admission was made in an opposition memorandum signed by Dorsey and Whitney claims counsel Peter Lancaster and Eric R. Sherman who represent Dorsey associate Peter R. Mayer. The party admission was made by Peter R. Mayer by way of his counsel on January 31, 2020 in this case pending in the District Court of Minnesota captioned *Fredin v. Miller*, Case No. 19-CV-3051-SRN-HB.

16. Peter R. Mayer was the opposing adverse counsel representing Catherine Schaefer in the state court action *Schaefer v. Fredin*. **On January 31, 2020, Mr. Mayer by way of his counsel stated a “mediation took place.”** (See [Doc 35] Dorsey. Opp. Mem. ¶ at p. 2 footnote 1.) Specifically, the party admission was made identifying that Lindquist and Vennum partner Michael Olafson mediated between parties during the *Schaefer v. Fredin* action.

17. Between January and March 21, 2016, Lindquist partner Mark Jacobsen was assigned as a mediator during the state court action *Miller v. Fredin*. In pre-trial sequences, Mr. Jacobson conducted mediation in conference rooms with Plaintiff present. During this, Mr. Jacobson became hostile and pushed Plaintiff toward accepting unfounded orders. Between June and November 18, 2016, Lindquist partner Michael Olafson was assigned as a mediator during the state court action *Schaefer v. Fredin*. In pre-trial sequences, Mr. Olafson conducted mediation in conference rooms with Plaintiff and his then attorney Nathan Hanson present. On January 2, 2018, Ballard purchased Lindquist.

18. Between 2018 and present, Lindquist/Ballard and its former partners has *pro bono* represented all adverse parties to Plaintiff. Upon information and belief, Ballard has a backchannel *quid-pro-quo* deal with former Lindquist non-equity associate Defendant Lindsey Middlecamp.

19. Plaintiff will call Attorney Breyer and Adam C. Ballinger as witness in this *instant* case. (*See February 12, 2020 Pl. Decl Ex. A ¶ at 1.*)

Attorney Breyer's Practicing Law
in Wisconsin Without License

20. Upon information and belief, Attorney Breyer is a licensed lawyer in the State of Minnesota. On October 27, 2000 Attorney Breyer was admitted to the bar in the State of Minnesota. Attorney Breyer has a lawyer identification of 0302259. (See <http://mars.courts.state.mn.us/AttorneyDetail.aspx?attyID=0302259>.) Upon information and belief, Attorney Breyer does not possess a license to practice law in Wisconsin. (*See https://www.wisbar.org/Pages/BasicLawyerSearch.aspx?firstName=karl&lastName=breyer&countyName=StCroix.*) (*See February 12, 2020 Pl. Ex. C.*)

21. On July 2, 2018 Attorney Breyer appeared by letter in *Fredin v. Schaefer, Saint Croix County Circuit Court, Case No. 2018CV000190* ("Wisconsin Action"). This is attached hereto as **EXHIBIT C**. The docket text reads:

From Atty Breyer dated 7/2/18 requesting adjournment of 7/6/18 hearing. Rec'd via fax. Per Judge Waterman, based on the recent letters from both parties, the July 6 hearing will be used only for purposes of scheduling. Atty. Breyer may participate by telephone. JA left vm advising attorney of phone number to call. Glg (*See https://wcca.wicourts.gov/caseDetail.html?caseNo=2018CV000190&countyNo=55&index=0&mode=details#records*.)

22. On July 6, 2018, Attorney Breyer appeared by telephone in *the Wisconsin Action*. The Docket text reads in part:

CO: RMW , REP: Drost, CLERK: Liddle. Petitioner Brock William Fredin in court. Atty John Breyer appears via phone on behalf of RE Catherine Schaefer. Case called at 11:19 a.m. Court notes this matter is set for a petition for a harassment restraining order ... Atty Breyer is a MN licensed attorney and needs to complete the pro hoc vice process. Atty Breyer is aware and is going to complete the process. Notes did not receive a copy of the letter filed by Mr. Fredin ... Atty Breyer to file a motion by 07-20-2018. PE responds to a briefing schedule. Court orders a response to be filed by PE by 08-03-2018. Mr. Fredin

requesting a date for an Oral Argument. PE is objecting to Atty Breyer's pro hoc vice application. Court adjourned at 11:27 a.m. Motion hearing scheduled for August 23, 2018 at 10:00 am. *Id.*

23. On July 11, 2018, Plaintiff objected. The docket text reads in part: "Notice of Objection to Pro Hac Vice Admission of K. Jon Breyer. Filed by Petitioner. Reviewed by RMW. Glg" *Id.*

24. On July 23, 2018, Attorney Breyer filed a motion to dismiss. The docket text reads: "Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss. Filed by Atty Breyer. Glg" *Id.* The Docket text further states: "[c]opy of Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss; Respondent's Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion to Dismiss; and Affidavit of K. Jon Breyer mailed to Petitioner Brock Fredin on 7/20/18. Filed by Atty Breyer. Glg" *Id.*

25. *On August 21, 2018, Attorney Breyer filed a letter. The docket text reads in part:*
"Letter from Atty Breyer dated 8/21/18 requesting to appear without Atty Singer at 8/23/18 MH. Rec'd via fax. Per Judge Waterman on 8-21-18, a Wisconsin licensed attorney must appear because: 1) no pro hac vice application was filed with the Court. 2) The Aug. 23 hearing was scheduled 6 weeks ago. 3) State v. Lehman involved extra ordinary circumstances that are not present here. JA faxed response to Attorney Breyer and mailed to PE and RE. glg" *Id.*

26. Upon information and belief, Attorney Breyer appeared by telephone and letter without *pro hac vice* status or a valid Wisconsin law license.

Attorney Breyer's Coordinated
Pile-On Filings and Rule 8.4 Violations
Improperly Threatening Criminal
Investigations in a Civil Case

27. On November 19, 2019, Ballard Spahr Counsel Leita Walker filed a frivolous sanctions motion over a typo in *Fredin v. City Pages*, Case No. 19-CV-472 [Doc 37-38]

28. On December 4, 2019, Assistant Minnesota Attorney General Joseph Weinger filed a frivolous Court ordered request for sanction in *Fredin v. Street*, Case No. 19-CV-2864 [Doc 29-

32]. On February 5, 2020 this Court denied the frivolous sanctions request. *See Fredin v. Street*, Case No. 19-CV-2864 [Doc 61].

29. On February 7, 2020, Attorney Breyer filed two (2) frivolous Rule 37 sanctions motions in *Fredin v. Middlecamp*, Case No. 17-CV-3058 [Doc 111-113] and *Fredin v. Miller*, Case No. 18-CV-466 [Doc 102-104].

30. On February 11, 2020 Plaintiff was provided with the City of Saint Paul FOIA production. After careful review, Plaintiff recognized Attorney Breyer's *ex parte* communication to third parties in the April 25 Email.

31. On February 7, 2020 Plaintiff sent a letter to the Court in *in Fredin v. Middlecamp*, Case No. 17-CV-3058 [Doc 116] and *Fredin v. Miller*, Case No. 18-CV-466 [Doc 107] notifying the Court of Attorney Breyer, Ballinger, Ms. Walker, and Mr. Weiner's coordinated activities in filing frivolous sanctions motions. Plaintiff requested all *ex parte* communication (not covered by attorney-client privilege) between third parties that were used to coordinate the above described pile-on sanctions motions to abuse the Court system.

32. Attorney Breyer filed the frivolous Rule 37 sanctions request with improper photographs of Plaintiff's bloodied mothers in an effort to commit fraud on the Court by alleging that Defendants were "frame[d]". *See Fredin v. Middlecamp*, Case No. 17-CV-3058 [Doc 111-113] and *Fredin v. Miller*, Case No. 18-CV-466 [Doc 102-104].

33. On February 11, 2020, following review of the FOIA request, Plaintiff emailed Attorney Breyer demanding all responsive documents and communications between third parties (not covered by privilege) used to conduct their pile-on scheme.

34. On February 11, 2020 Attorney Breyer responded by stating: "If you file anything with the Court ... we will refer the matter to the US Attorney's Office to prosecute you for

perjury.” (*See Pl. Decl. Ex. B.*) Upon information and belief, the term “[w]e” represents Adam C. Ballinger, Leita Walker, Peter Lancaster, Peter R. Mayer, and Joseph Weiner. *Id.* In other words, Attorney Ballinger is threatening to use Defendant Middlecamp to coverup violent assault, torture, prejudicial discrimination, flagrant constitutional violations, and false imprisonment. This violates Minn. R. Prof. Cond. Rule 8.4 by improperly threatening a criminal investigation in this civil action.

35. Upon information and belief, the term “if you file anything with the Court” refers to filing the February 11, 2020 FOIA request. *Id.* The February 11, 2020 FOIA request was again timed to defy all discovery schedules including the October 1, 2019 non-dispositive deadline, January 24, 2020 dispositive deadline, and February 7, 2020 expert discovery in *Fredin v. Middlecamp*, Case No. 17-CV-3058 and *Fredin v. Miller*, Case No. 18-CV-466.

36. Upon information and belief, the term “we will refer the matter to the US Attorney’s Office to prosecute you” refers to the continued use of Defendant Middlecamp’s current and position Special Assistant United States Attorney and past position as an Assistant Minneapolis City Attorney to gain personal advantage in this civil matter. (*See February 12, 2020 Pl. Decl Ex. B.*) Moreover, the sanctions motions used to silence Plaintiff were timed around the February 11, 2020 FOIA document production lending further credence to coordinated activities. This violates Minn. R. Prof. Cond. Rule 8.4 by improperly threatening a criminal investigation in this civil action.

Withholding Exculpatory Evidence
(April 28, 2017 Search Warrant)

37. As described above, Plaintiff received a February 11, 2020 FOIA request from the City of Saint Paul. (*See February 12, 2020 Pl. Decl Ex. A ¶ at 1.*) The FOIA document dump contained about two (200) or three (300) hundred documents. The FOIA request sheds new light

on evidence withheld by Attorney Breyer and Defendants. (*See February 12, 2020 Pl. Decl* Ex. D.)

38. Attorney Breyer withheld an email Defendant Middlecamp sent on April 21, 2017 to Saint Paul Police Officer David McCabe. This is attached hereto as **EXHIBIT D**. The email was captioned with a subject line “[c]urrent address for Brock Fredin”. *Id.* Defendant Middlecamp used the email lindsey.e.middlecamp@gmail.com. *Id.* Mr. McCabe received the email using his official Saint Paul Police department email. *Id.* The email states “Sgt. McCabe, I just had word that the restraining order I was attempting to have served on Brock Fredin via the Ramsey County sheriff’s office came back on service because he no longer lives at the address I provided them. I am wondering if you have a current address for Brock and whether you would be willing to contact the Ramsey County sheriffs office and provide it to them for the purposes of effectuating service of that restraining order. Sent from my iPhone.” *Id.* On April 21, 2017 Mr. McCabe responds stating “What address did you put on the order?” *Id.*

- On April 21, 2017 Defendant Middlecamp responds stating “[t]he Grand Ave rental. Landlord said he no longer lives there.” Upon information and belief, this was an address of 1180 Grand Ave, Saint Paul, MN. The only reason that Defendant Middlecamp would know that address is through Defendant Schaefer or Miller or viewing confidential state court filings using her position as an Assistant Minneapolis City Attorney. *Id.*
- *On April 21, 2017, Mr. McCabe responds stating “[s]end me your order.” Id.*
- *On April 21, 2017 Mr. McCabe sends an email to Benet Witzmann with a caption “Brock FREDIN.” The email states “in addition information was passed through your Office to Courts about him creating websites about RC Judges and Referees. I have also received information that RCSO Civil Process tried serving him with an HRO this week, but found that he moved. From what I know, the RC Domestic Abuse Office (651-266-5130, Nykee Younghans) would need his new address to facilitate the service of this new HRO. Though my investigation I found his new address in CLEAR as; 1905 iris Bay, Hudson WI 54016. I hope this information helps the County.” Id.*
- On July 4, 2017 Mr. McCabe sent an email to Stephen Christie stating “Steven can you please advise Sgt. Boyer and I how you would like to proceed with this

request. This forensic exam is still underway. The warrant for those devices was written under the probable cause of the crimes for which Fredin was charged (your case)¹ and **not any of the other cases (since there was no PC to charge, per SPCA Vang)**. The forensic team was instructed that if something was found outside of the scope of the charged case which could be evidence in the other ones, that they should let us know so we could write a second warrant.”

- On July 5, 2017 Mr. McCabe wrote an email to Adam Siegried. The email stated “Just to clarify/remind; the search of his devices is for data related to the stalking of GRACE MILLER. Should you find any data related to Catherine Schaefer or any other potential victim let us know and we can write a new warrant.”

39. Upon information and belief, Benet Witzmann is a Ramsey County Sheriff’s Office official. The term “[i]n addition information was passed through your Office to Courts about him creating websites about RC Judges and Referees” likely means extrajudicial communication to the Ramsey County District Court bench. (See February 12, 2020 Pl. Decl. Ex. D at 4.)

40. At all times relevant herein, Attorney Breyer, including Defendants misrepresented their claims and committed fraud on this Court in *Fredin v. Miller et al*, Case No. 18-CV-466, *Fredin v. Middlecamp*, Case No. 17-CV-3058, and *Fredin v. Clysdale*, Case No. 18-CV-510. Specifically, Attorney Breyer used these actions to collaterally withhold exculpatory evidence in state court criminal cases captioned *State v. Fredin*, Case No. 62-CR-17-3156 to effectuate wrongful convictions, illegally torture, assault, and imprison Plaintiff. Furthermore, Attorney Breyer withheld and misrepresented his claims in the pending Eighth (8) circuit appeal in *Fredin v. Clysdale*, Case No. 19-1726. These documents conclusively evidence the abuse of process claim

¹ After the Minnesota Supreme Court voided the mail harassment statute, charges were reversed and vacated in the *Miller* state case, Plaintiff contends that probable cause is questionable and can now be challenged.

with reference to the unlawful April 28, 2017 search warrant relevant to *Fredin v. Clysdale*, Case No. 19-1726.

City Pages Scheme to Pressure/Pursue
Frivolous Charges and Raid

41. Attorney Breyer withheld an April 21, 2017 email from Defendant Grace Miller to Mr. McCabe captioned “more posts”. This is attached hereto as **EXHIBIT E**. Defendant Miller used an email mill6531@umn.edu. Mr. McCabe was using his official email. The email stated “I emailed the writer last night … He’s thinking about just locking the comments … **I have very little sympathy for his current situation.**” (*See* February 12, 2020 Pl. Decl. Ex. E.) The email was part-in-parcel to a scheme to use the *City Pages* to pursue frivolous charges and use the April 28, 2017 raid to serve a restraining order.

- On April 21, 2017 Mr. McCabe responds to Defendant Miller “can you send me the writers email. I will also express my desire that he closes the comments on that article. That should help if he is hesitant.” *Id.*
- Defendant Miller responds “It’s mmullen@citypages.com. I think he’ll lock them if I ask.”

Likely Coverup up Defendants Knowledge of Backchannel
Extrajudicial Communication to Judge Vuelo
from David McCabe and Stephen Christie

42. On February 21, 2018 Assistant Saint Paul City Attorney Stephen Christie states in an email to Saint Paul Police Officer David McCabe “Judge Vuelo has been informed of the video.” This is attached hereto as **EXHIBIT G**. (*See* February 12, 2020 Pl. Decl. Ex. F.)

Judge Vuelo has been informed of the video

Specifically, the “video” allegation relates to Mr. McCabe’s iPhone email stating “[h]as she seen the video Brock made about Yamy”:

Has she seen the video Brock made about Yamy

Id. Upon information and belief, Yamy Vang is believed to be Saint Paul Assistant City Attorney Yamy Vang. This *extrajudicial* communication violates Minn. Code of Judicial Conduct Rule 2.9 (*ex parte* communications) and violates Minn. R. Prof. Cond. Rule 1.6. Moreover, Mr. McCabe was a witness at the state court trial. These documents were withheld and used to prime Ms. Vuelo's outrageous sentence. Ms. Vuelo made reference to this video at sentencing on October 17, 2018.

43. Various other documents contained in the February 11, 2020 production are contained as **EXHIBIT G.** (*See* February 12, 2020 Pl. Decl. Ex. G.)

Dated: February 12, 2020
Hudson, WI



s/ Brock Fredin

Brock Fredin
Hudson, WI 54016
(612) 424-5512 (tel.)
brockfredinlegal@icloud.com
Plaintiff, Pro Se

A

Dunn, Storme (CI-StPaul)

Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 1:35 PM
To: Patet, Tara (CI-StPaul)
Subject: FW: New documentation of suspected criminal violation of restraining order by Brock Fredin

Hi Tara,

Below is an email that

From: Lindsey Middlecamp [mailto:lindsey.e.middlecamp@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 11:38 AM
To: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul); Nasset, Sarah (CI-StPaul)
Cc: mayer.peter@dorsey.com; Catherine Schaefer; Grace Miller; Breyer, Jon; Ballinger, Adam C.
Subject: New documentation of suspected criminal violation of restraining order by Brock Fredin

Good morning,

I do know what jurisdiction of law enforcement we should be reporting this to (Catherine is in Hennepin County, Brock seems to reside in Baldwin, Wisconsin, but St. Paul has an existing criminal file on him which includes prior conduct within St. Paul previously declined for prosecution that may now take on a different tenor in light of this new evidence.) At any rate, I wanted to keep the St. Paul investigators most familiar with his case apprised of new evidence of Brock intentionally violating a restraining order by contacting Catherine Schaefer while her restraining order was in place, and seek guidance on who this should be reported to and what can be done.

Documentation is attached and the relevant chronology is as follows:

Catherine has previously reported prior contacts from 2016 believed to be Brock Fredin to the St. Paul police but the investigation by Sgt. McCabe did not at that time get accepted for prosecution and was unable to conclusively prove that the contacts originated from Brock.

On October 2, 2017, Catherine Schaefer received a text message from an unknown number that said "Hi Cat." The only person who has ever messaged Catherine using this moniker is Brock Fredin, so she was immediately concerned that it was Brock or someone reaching out to her on his behalf.

Catherine asked the messenger who they were, and the response was "Kelli." Catherine requested a photograph and received a photograph of a woman Catherine did not recognize. "Kelli" asked Catherine to send a recent photograph of herself back, asked Catherine where she was working, and for other updates about Catherine's life. Hoping to determine whether "Kelli" was in fact a real person or Brock, Catherine asked "Kelli" to send her an additional photograph holding a fork and sitting, clothed, on a toilet (hoping the unique instructions would weed out stock photographs.)

While she was waiting for "Kelli" to respond, Lindsey Middlecamp and Catherine Schaefer discussed strategies for determining and proving whether this anonymous messenger was in fact Brock or someone acting on Brock's behalf. (Previously, someone who had contacted Catherine indicated they had been paid \$40 by someone else to relay her a message; we suspected if "Kelli" was a real person at all, this might have been a similar circumstance.)

Dunn, Storme (CI-StPaul)

From: Lindsey Middlecamp <lindsey.e.middlecamp@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 12:47 PM
To: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul);Nasset, Sarah (CI-StPaul)
Cc: mayer.peter@dorsey.com;Catherine Schaefer;Grace Miller;Breyer, Jon;Ballinger, Adam C.
Subject: Re: New documentation of suspected criminal violation of restraining order by Brock Fredin

All,

I apologize--if you have not read my prior email, you can disregard. I have now spoken with Catherine and determined that in fact, these screenshots were provided to the St. Paul police last fall, and they were included in a police report that Brock has apparently subsequently obtained. I was operating under the false impression that the only way he could have gotten the message was if he'd had a role in the communications but it sounds like that is not the only possible manner he obtained them and it is not the smoking gun evidence I had believed when I saw it this morning.

Thanks nonetheless for your collective work on this matter,
Lindsey

On Wed, Apr 25, 2018 at 11:38 AM, Lindsey Middlecamp <lindsey.e.middlecamp@gmail.com> wrote:
Good morning,

I do know what jurisdiction of law enforcement we should be reporting this to (Catherine is in Hennepin County, Brock seems to reside in Baldwin, Wisconsin, but St. Paul has an existing criminal file on him which includes prior conduct within St. Paul previously declined for prosecution that may now take on a different tenor in light of this new evidence.) At any rate, I wanted to keep the St. Paul investigators most familiar with his case apprised of new evidence of Brock intentionally violating a restraining order by contacting Catherine Schaefer while her restraining order was in place, and seek guidance on who this should be reported to and what can be done.

Documentation is attached and the relevant chronology is as follows:

Catherine has previously reported prior contacts from 2016 believed to be Brock Fredin to the St. Paul police but the investigation by Sgt. McCabe did not at that time get accepted for prosecution and was unable to conclusively prove that the contacts originated from Brock.

On October 2, 2017, Catherine Schaefer received a text message from an unknown number that said "Hi Cat." The only person who has ever messaged Catherine using this moniker is Brock Fredin, so she was immediately concerned that it was Brock or someone reaching out to her on his behalf.

Catherine asked the messenger who they were, and the response was "Kelli." Catherine requested a photograph and received a photograph of a woman Catherine did not recognize. "Kelli" asked Catherine to send a recent photograph of herself back, asked Catherine where she was working, and for other updates about Catherine's life. Hoping to determine whether "Kelli" was in fact a real person or Brock, Catherine asked "Kelli" to send her an additional photograph holding a fork and sitting, clothed, on a toilet (hoping the unique instructions would weed out stock photographs.)

While she was waiting for "Kelli" to respond, Lindsey Middlecamp and Catherine Schaefer discussed strategies for determining and proving whether this anonymous messenger was in fact Brock or someone acting on Brock's behalf.

(Previously, someone who had contacted Catherine indicated they had been paid \$40 by someone else to relay her a message; we suspected if "Kelli" was a real person at all, this might have been a similar circumstance.)

The two agreed that if Catherine provided Brock with unique false information he might later include it in a court filing and they would be able to track it to this message exchange. They brainstormed and decided the most believable false information to provide that Brock would be most likely to raise in a legal proceeding would be to fabricate that Lindsey Middlecamp and Referee Elizabeth Clysdale were friendly acquaintances and had been hanging out socially for years. (In reality, Lindsey has never heard of or met Referee Clysdale outside of her court appearances in her matter involving Brock Fredin.) Catherine sent a message to that effect on October 3, 2017.

At the time, "Kelli" feigned ignorance about who the names were that Catherine had sent and after several more messages (including a message that eventually sent a photograph of "Kelli" holding a fork, which Catherine and Lindsey believe Brock likely paid or persuaded a woman online to send him to transmit to Catherine) contact ceased.

Nothing came of it until today (April 25, 2018) when Brock Fredin's twitter (www.twitter.com/brock_fredin, an account his victims have been monitoring but not interacting with in any manner) posted a series of angry messages about Referee Clysdale being a corrupt referee.

Significantly, one of those tweets published by Brock Fredin claims that Referee Clysdale is friends with one of the "corrupt litigants" (Lindsey Middlecamp) and with that tweet, Brock affirmatively published a redacted screenshot of the same message Catherine sent "Kelli." Catherine and Lindsey are the only other people in possession of that message and have never disclosed it to anyone, posted it publicly, or used it in any filings.

This proves one of two things: either Brock directed a third party to contact Catherine, or more likely, Brock himself directly contacted Catherine Schaefer using an anonymous phone number in October 2017 and photos provided to him by a woman online to hide his identity.

This evidence establishes a criminal violation of Catherine's restraining order and lends additional support to Catherine's belief that prior contacts in 2016 and 2017 which Brock has insisted were "telemarketers" were also him acting on his own behalf or via third parties.

Screenshots are attached. My concern about proceeding in the civil context only is that Brock will simply claim he doesn't run this Twitter account (@Brock_Fredin) or doesn't know where that image came from, etc. so I am really hoping someone in law enforcement will have the desire to seize and preserve or subpoena sufficient evidence to prove what Catherine has been saying for years. I understand that resources are tight and there are many victims whose cases require attention, but any help and guidance you can provide would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you,
Lindsey Middlecamp

B

From: Breyer, K. Jon Jon.Breyer@KutakRock.com 
Subject: RE: Fredin v. Miller, Case No. 19-CV-3051
Date: February 11, 2020 at 1:31 PM
To: brock fredin brockfredinlegal@gmail.com

KB

If you file anything with the Court suggesting you did not, we will refer the matter to the US Attorney's Office to prosecute you for perjury. Lying to the Court is a serious matter.

K. Jon
Breyer

KUTAKROCK

Kutak Rock LLP 60 South Sixth Street, Suite 3400 | Minneapolis, MN
55402-4018
d: 612.334.5057 o: 616.334.5000 jon.breyer@kutakrock.com

C

St Croix County Case Number 2018CV000190 Brock William Fredin vs. Catherine Schaefer

Case summary

Filing date	Case type	Case status
05-18-2018	Civil	Closed

Class code description	Responsible official	Branch ID
Harassment Restraining Order	Waterman, R. Michael	4

Party summary

Party type	Party name	Party status
Petitioner	Fredin, Brock William	
Respondent	Schaefer, Catherine	

Parties

Petitioner: Fredin, Brock William

Date of birth	Sex	Race
12-1983		

Address

Respondent: Schaefer, Catherine

Date of birth	Sex	Race
07-1984	Female	Caucasian

Address

Party Address Sealed by Court Commissioner Heckmann

Attorneys

Attorney name	Guardian ad litem	Entered
Singer, George H	No	08-22-2018

Court record

Date	Event	Court official	Court reporter	Amount
01-11-2019	Remittitur/Court of Appeals dec & order dismissing			

Additional text:

dated 1/8/19. Filed by COA. glg

08-21-2018 Letters/correspondence

Additional text:

Letter from Atty Breyer dated 8/21/18 requesting to appear without Atty Singer at 8/23/18 MH. Rec'd via fax. Per Judge Waterman on 8-21-18, a Wisconsin licensed attorney must appear because: 1) no pro hac vice application was filed with the Court. 2) The Aug. 23 hearing was scheduled 6 weeks ago. 3) State v. Lehman involved extra ordinary circumstances that are not present here. JA faxed response to Attorney Breyer and mailed to PE and RE. glg

08-08-2018 Request

Additional text:

Request form Atty Breyer dated 8/7/18 requesting copies of PE's 8/3/18 filing with attached payment confirmation. Rec'd via fax. glg

08-07-2018 Telephone message

Additional text:

w/Mary at Atty Breyer's Office re: PE's 8/3 filing. kak

08-03-2018 Memorandum of law

Date	Event	Court official	Court reporter	Amount
Additional text:				
In Objection to Motion to Dismiss, filed by the PL via fax. To ty. kak				
07-23-2018	Received documents			
Additional text:				
Cover letter dated 7/20/18 with Motion to Dismiss. glg				
07-23-2018	Affidavit			
Additional text:				
Affidavit of K. Jon Breyer with Exhibits A-G. Filed by Atty Breyer. glg				
07-23-2018	Affidavit of mailing			
Additional text:				
Copy of Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss; Respondent's Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion to Dismiss; and Affidavit of K. Jon Breyer mailed to Petitioner Brock Fredin on 7/20/18. Filed by Atty Breyer. glg				
07-23-2018	Brief in support of motion			
Additional text:				
Respondent's Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion to Dismiss. Filed by Atty Breyer. glg				
07-23-2018	Notice of motion, motion			
Additional text:				
Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss. Filed by Atty Breyer. glg				
07-11-2018	Memorandum of law			
Additional text:				
Memorandum of Law in Objection to Pro Hac Vice Admission of K. Jon Breyer. Filed by Petitioner. Reviewed by RMW. glg				
07-11-2018	Notice			
Additional text:				
Notice of Objection to Pro Hac Vice Admission of K. Jon Breyer. Filed by Petitioner. Reviewed by RMW. glg				

Date	Event	Court official	Court reporter	Amount
Additional text:				
Motion hearing on August 23, 2018 at 10:00 am.				
07-06-2018	Hearing De Novo	Waterman, R. Michael	Drost, Erin D	
Additional text:				
CO: RMW , REP: Drost, CLERK: Liddle. Petitioner Brock William Fredin in court. Atty John Breyer appears via phone on behalf of RE Catherine Schaefer. Case called at 11:19 a.m. Court notes this matter is set for a petition for a harassment restraining order. This matter was dismissed prior before the court commissioner. Atty Breyer is a MN licensed attorney and needs to complete the pro hoc vice process. Atty Breyer is aware and is going to complete the process. Notes did not receive a copy of the letter filed by Mr. Fredin. Makes statement regarding different pending matters. Court addressess letters received regarding jurisdiction. Atty Breyer to file a motion by 07-20-2018. PE responds to a briefing schedule. Court orders a response to be filed by PE by 08-03-2018. Mr. Fredin requesting a date for an Oral Argument. PE is objecting to Atty Breyer's pro hoc vice application. Court adjourned at 11:27 a.m. Motion hearing scheduled for August 23, 2018 at 10:00 am.				
07-02-2018	Response/reply			
Additional text:				
Letter from Petitioner dated 7/2/18 in response to Atty Breyer's 7/2/18 letter with attachments. Clerk notes poor quality of attachments. Reviewed by RMW. glg				
07-02-2018	Letters/correspondence			
Additional text:				
From Atty Breyer dated 7/2/18 requesting adjournment of 7/6/18 hearing. Rec'd via fax. Per Judge Waterman, based on the recent letters from both parties, the July 6 hearing will be used only for purposes of scheduling. Atty. Breyer may participate by telephone. JA left vm advising attorney of phone number to call. glg				

D

Dunn, Storme (CI-StPaul)

Sent: Friday, April 21, 2017 3:12 PM
To: Lindsey Middlecamp
Subject: RE: Current address for Brock Fredin

Send me your order

-----Original Message-----

From: Lindsey Middlecamp [mailto:lindsey.e.middlecamp@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2017 2:53 PM

To: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Re: Current address for Brock Fredin

The Grand Ave rental. Landlord said he no longer lives there.

Sent from my iPhone

> On Apr 21, 2017, at 1:52 PM, McCabe, David (CI-StPaul) <david.mccabe@ci.stpaul.mn.us> wrote:

>

> What address did you put on the order?

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Lindsey Middlecamp [mailto:lindsey.e.middlecamp@gmail.com]

> Sent: Friday, April 21, 2017 2:51 PM

> To: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)

> Subject: Current address for Brock Fredin

>

> Sgt. McCabe,

>

> I have just had word that the restraining order I was attempting to have served on Brock Fredin via the Ramsey County sheriff's office came back on service because he no longer lives at the address I provided them.

>

> I am wondering if you have a current address for Brock and whether you would be willing to contact the Ramsey County sheriffs office and provide it to them for the purpose of effectuating service of that restraining order.

>

>

> Sent from my iPhone

Dunn, Storme (CI-StPaul)

From: Lindsey Middlecamp <lindsey.e.middlecamp@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2017 2:53 PM
To: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Re: Current address for Brock Fredin

The Grand Ave rental. Landlord said he no longer lives there.

Sent from my iPhone

> On Apr 21, 2017, at 1:52 PM, McCabe, David (CI-StPaul) <david.mccabe@ci.stpaul.mn.us> wrote:
>
> What address did you put on the order?
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Lindsey Middlecamp [mailto:lindsey.e.middlecamp@gmail.com]
> Sent: Friday, April 21, 2017 2:51 PM
> To: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
> Subject: Current address for Brock Fredin
>
> Sgt. McCabe,
>
> I have just had word that the restraining order I was attempting to have served on Brock Fredin via the Ramsey County sheriff's office came back on service because he no longer lives at the address I provided them.
>
> I am wondering if you have a current address for Brock and whether you would be willing to contact the Ramsey County sheriffs office and provide it to them for the purpose of effectuating service of that restraining order.
>
>
> Sent from my iPhone

Dunn, Storme (CI-StPaul)

From: Lindsey Middlecamp <lindsey.e.middlecamp@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2017 2:51 PM
To: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Current address for Brock Fredin

Sgt. McCabe,

I have just had word that the restraining order I was attempting to have served on Brock Fredin via the Ramsey County sheriff's office came back on service because he no longer lives at the address I provided them.

I am wondering if you have a current address for Brock and whether you would be willing to contact the Ramsey County sheriffs office and provide it to them for the purpose of effectuating service of that restraining order.

Sent from my iPhone

Dunn, Storme (CI-StPaul)

From: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2017 4:16 PM
To: Witzmann, Benet
Subject: Brock FREDIN

Benet,

Brock FREDIN is the subject of a SPPD investigation (16-026382), in addition information was passed through your Office to Courts about him creating websites about RC Judges and Referees. I have also received information that RCSO Civil Process tried serving him with an HRO this week, but found that he moved. From what I know, the RC Domestic Abuse Office (651-266-5130, Nykee Younghans) would need his new address to facilitate the service of this new HRO.

Through my investigation I found his new address in CLEAR as; **1905 Iris Bay, Hudson WI 54016**

I hope this information helps the County.



***Sergeant David McCabe
Sex Crimes Unit & Mobile Field Force***

Saint Paul Police Department
367 Grove Street
Saint Paul, MN 55101
Phone 651-266-5702
Fax 651-266-5529
david.mccabe@ci.stpaul.mn.us

E

Dunn, Storme (CI-StPaul)

From: Grace Miller <mill6531@umn.edu>
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2017 10:39 AM
To: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Subject: RE: more posts

It's mmullen@citypages.com. I think he'll lock them if I ask.

As far as professional impact, I haven't dealt with any yet. I've been at this unit for a couple years, and these people know me. I have told my boss about it, and we're on the same page.

BUT that will change when I leave here. I'm applying for a legislative fellowship next year and I won't get it if there's dirt about me on the internet - it's super selective, and I imagine the background checks are very stringent. I have been looking at datingpsychos and his facebook and other sites like the City Pages article now, just to make sure a bunch of defamation doesn't accumulate in the far reaches of the internet to surprise me next time I look for a job. It's exhausting but I feel like I have to watch for it.

On Apr 21, 2017 9:59 AM, "McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)" <david.mccabe@ci.stpaul.mn.us> wrote:

Can you send me the writers email. I will also express my desire that he closes the comments on that article. That should help if he is hesitant

From: Grace Miller [mailto:mill6531@umn.edu]
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2017 8:44 AM
To: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Subject: RE: more posts

Yes - I emailed the writer last night and asked him to remove the posts. He's thinking about just locking the comments so that no one else can write anything. I really don't like my name (especially with my military rank) posted publicly, but Brock has been posting defamation with my full name and military rank since last June. I have very little sympathy for his current situation.

On Apr 21, 2017 7:36 AM, "McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)" <david.mccabe@ci.stpaul.mn.us> wrote:

Ok, I will add these. It looks like they are down based off of the link you sent. Do you know if City Pages has been editing their comments for that article? I will try to work backwards from facebook and see what that turns up.

From: Grace Miller [mailto:mill6531@umn.edu]
Sent: Thursday, April 20, 2017 9:21 PM
To: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Subject: more posts

Hi Sgt McCabe,

Brock posted several responses to the City Pages article in which he addresses me by name and military rank (and Catherine as well) and accuses us both of criminal activity. I've attached some screen shots, but the comments are here:

<http://www.citypages.com/news/accused-stalker-brock-fredin-is-writing-a-horror-story-and-hes-the-main-character/414395703>

Grace

Dunn, Storme (CI-StPaul)

From: Grace Miller <mill6531@umn.edu>
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2017 8:44 AM
To: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Subject: RE: more posts

Yes - I emailed the writer last night and asked him to remove the posts. He's thinking about just locking the comments so that no one else can write anything. I really don't like my name (especially with my military rank) posted publicly, but Brock has been posting defamation with my full name and military rank since last June. I have very little sympathy for his current situation.

On Apr 21, 2017 7:36 AM, "McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)" <david.mccabe@ci.stpaul.mn.us> wrote:

Ok, I will add these. It looks like they are down based off of the link you sent. Do you know if City Pages has been editing their comments for that article? I will try to work backwards from facebook and see what that turns up.

From: Grace Miller [mailto:mill6531@umn.edu]
Sent: Thursday, April 20, 2017 9:21 PM
To: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Subject: more posts

Hi Sgt McCabe,

Brock posted several responses to the City Pages article in which he addresses me by name and military rank (and Catherine as well) and accuses us both of criminal activity. I've attached some screen shots, but the comments are here:

<http://www.citypages.com/news/accused-stalker-brock-fredin-is-writing-a-horror-story-and-hes-the-main-character/414395703>

Grace

F

Dunn, Storme (CI-StPaul)

From: Christie, Steve (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2018 10:13 AM
To: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Re: Brock Fredin stalking trial date: May 14

Judge Vuelo has been informed of the video but it would be inappropriate for her to view it before the end of our case.

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 20, 2018, at 5:10 PM, McCabe, David (CI-StPaul) <david.mccabe@ci.stpaul.mn.us> wrote:

Steve, thank you for the update, that all sounds good. Nice idea about Nicole, she is sharp. I was aware about his recent arrest. Glad Maria is working it.

Also I saw the vuelo is the judge. Has she seen the video Brock made about Yamy running for judge and not speaking English....

Thank you again for the update.

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 20, 2018, at 11:12 AM, Christie, Steve (CI-StPaul) <steve.christie@ci.stpaul.mn.us> wrote:

Dave—

The Fredin case is now set for a trial during the week of May 14. Grace Miller was not available for trial next month because she'll be out of the country for a while. It is not a date certain and thus will be called along with a lot of other cases. My new legal assistant is Shawn McDonald (266-8729).

Fredin has recently filed a notice of defense claiming that his actions are constitutionally protected speech (the stalking statute provides for this unusual exception). I'll be filing a legal memorandum arguing that the defense is not available to Fredin as a matter of law. In the unlikely event I'm not able to convince Judge Vuelo (brand new judge) to our point of view, I have tentatively reached out to Sgt. Nicole Spears as a prosecution witness to give testimony in the form of a legal opinion that such conduct is not protected by the First Amendment. As you probably know, Sgt. Spears is also a licensed attorney.

--Steve Christie

p.s. Fredin is also being separately prosecuted by Maria DeWolf for an HRO violation involving Middlecamp at the JFJC after a court hearing.

G

Dunn, Storme (CI-StPaul)

From: Christie, Steve (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 11:13 AM
To: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Cc: McDonald, Shawn (CI-StPaul);Spears, Nicole (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Brock Fredin stalking trial date: May 14

Dave—

The Fredin case is now set for a trial during the week of May 14. Grace Miller was not available for trial next month because she'll be out of the country for a while. It is not a date certain and thus will be called along with a lot of other cases. My new legal assistant is Shawn McDonald (266-8729).

Fredin has recently filed a notice of defense claiming that his actions are constitutionally protected speech (the stalking statute provides for this unusual exception). I'll be filing a legal memorandum arguing that the defense is not available to Fredin as a matter of law. In the unlikely event I'm not able to convince Judge Vuelo (brand new judge) to our point of view, I have tentatively reached out to Sgt. Nicole Spears as a prosecution witness to give testimony in the form of a legal opinion that such conduct is not protected by the First Amendment. As you probably know, Sgt. Spears is also a licensed attorney.

--Steve Christie

p.s. Fredin is also being separately prosecuted by Maria DeWolf for an HRO violation involving Middlecamp at the JFJC after a court hearing.

Dunn, Storme (CI-StPaul)

From: Mathison, David (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Thursday, April 20, 2017 10:37 AM
To: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Cc: Mathison, David (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Re: Brock FREDIN

Thanks Dave,

I forwarded to Courts for their info.

Dave

David Mathison, Commander
Saint Paul Police Department
Special Investigations Unit / Safe Streets Task Force
367 Grove Street
Saint Paul, MN 55102
651-266-5619
david.mathison@ci.stpaul.mn.us

From: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Thursday, April 20, 2017 9:45 AM
To: Mathison, David (CI-StPaul)
Cc: Keating, John (CI-StPaul); Mack, Daniel (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Brock FREDIN

A couple of more sites that he has made...

From: Grace Miller [mailto:mill6531@umn.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, April 19, 2017 4:53 PM
To: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Elizabeth Clysdale site

Hi Sgt McCabe,

Here's another site Brock made:

<http://www.elizabethclysdale.com>

I imagine it will be useful to Lindsey's case because it looks exactly like the one Brock made about Lindsey, so it links the site to him, I would think. Does Elizabeth Clysdale know this is going on? Is there any way to get in touch with her?

Also, Lindsey was granted a restraining order on Friday, which states that Brock has to take down lindseymiddlecamp.com and all his social media posts that include her name. I don't know if it's been served yet, though.

Lindsey Middlecamp @CardsAgstHrsmt

lindseymiddlecamp.com

Attorney Lindsey Middlecamp. Current Employer: Attorney at City of Minneapolis Former Employer: Lindquist and Vennum LLP Lindsey Middlecamp is a licensed attorney ...

Thanks again,

Grace

Dunn, Storme (CI-StPaul)

From: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Friday, March 31, 2017 8:26 AM
To: Vang, Yamy (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Fwd: Re: Pathetic Protection

Just FYI, I just received this, is there a chance we can expedite this? At least the charge for Miller's case.

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: Brock F <brockf12@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 31, 2017 8:15:13 AM
To: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Re: Pathetic Protection

What do you mean mean 'cases'? Be very clear, David. You/Boyer submitted a case suggesting charges for whom?

I gave you precise and clear evidence prior to any trial regarding Schaefer's use of content that violated the revenge porn law. You ignored this and failed to offer the court any insight whatsoever to prevent her false order. At one point, you even 'played stupid' and you're not stupid. It's you alone who may hold responsibility for not offering insight to the court and indirectly enabling their behavior and the subsequent consequences.

On Mon, Mar 27, 2017 at 6:38 AM, McCabe, David (CI-StPaul) <david.mccabe@ci.stpaul.mn.us> wrote:

Brock, I understand you are frustrated, but as I stated before,

- The police cannot prevent someone from seeking an HRO, we are not allowed.
- The police cannot censor City Pages, we are not allowed.
- We are limited in what we can do and do the best with what we can.

The cases involving you (including Sgt Boyer's case) have been turned over to the St Paul City Attorney's Office for review. Criminal charging is solely their authority. We simply collect information and pass it onto them. Any decision to file charges or not file charges is up to them. My understanding is that everything is still under review and I do not have a timeline for their work.

Should you have any further concerns, please refer to my supervisor; Commander Josh Lego ([651-266-5655](tel:651-266-5655), Joshua.lego@ci.stpaul.mn.us)

Sincerely,

Sergeant David McCabe



Sex Crimes Unit

Saint Paul Police Department
367 Grove Street
Saint Paul, MN 55101
Phone [651-266-5702](tel:651-266-5702)
Fax [651-266-5529](tel:651-266-5529)
david.mccabe@ci.stpaul.mn.us

From: Brock F [<mailto:brockf12@gmail.com>]
Sent: Friday, March 24, 2017 3:18 PM
To: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Pathetic Protection

My mother had a stroke and now has deficits walking. Stress from this crazy nonsense contributed.

You failed to prevent Schaefer's false HRO, the highly misleading City Pages hit piece, and so far have enabled Schaefer's criminal activity. I've grown increasingly frustrated with your efforts. Why would you enable their 'operation' on me? Horrible!

My career has been trashed. I've reached my limit.

- Brock Fredin

Dunn, Storme (CI-StPaul)

From: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2017 9:51 AM
To: Lindsey Middlecamp
Subject: RE: Brock Fredin follow up

Its sounds like you have it all covered. Call 911 if he shows up.

I cannot force you to take the Tweet down. I understand your reasons, just be prepared in the event he takes the issue to court (ie, applies for his own HRO). Right now he is painting himself as the victim of all this. With that said, I would be open to speak with any woman who has been the subject of his harassment.

I doubt he would be charged with Trespassing even if you tell him not to come there. I think the law requires him to be present to then be verbally trespassed and if he returns that is the criminal violation, however I could be wrong. You may have better resources for that. I also feel you have enough to seek an HRO without him actually showing up, just his online behavior should be enough.

From: Lindsey Middlecamp [mailto:lindsey.e.middlecamp@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2017 9:41 AM
To: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Re: Brock Fredin follow up

Thank you so much, Seargent. I appreciate your response and will be forwarding you the email I have. I've contacted Chase and Christina to get their permission to provide contact information and forward you what they've sent me as well.

Although I recognize removing the tweet may be a way to deter his interest I will also tell you I've had two strangers contact me via twitter in the past weekend to set up phone calls and tell me horrifying month-long harassment and stalking experiences involving Brock that they have never reported to the police or the court system, just because they saw the tweet retweeted and recognized his face. I've strongly encouraged them to do so now and to get in touch with you, but even if they do not (in their mind, involving the legal system will just fuel his attentions) it confirms for me the importance of having his face and name on social media. Someone else sent me a screenshot to confirm he is continuing to use a fake name on dating applications, again underscoring why I intend to not delete the tweet to the extent the photo helps warn other women. All of that said: if I were an officer tasked first and foremost with protection rather than warning the public, it's the advice I would give too.

In terms of the event this Wednesday evening it is called "Break the Silence" and is at the Ukrainian Event Center in Minneapolis from 6-8pm. If Brock is told *in advance* (for instance, by e-mail) by an organizer that because it is a private event for survivors and because of the outstanding restraining orders against him he is not welcome on the property, would that help create a stronger case against him more than, say, waiting until he does show up and telling him he's not welcome (in which case, if he left cooperatively right away it would potentially not be grounds for a trespass charge?) I agree with you that he seems not quite like the type to confront in person but if he does I want that single instance of showing up to a place I'm going to be to be adequate grounds for an HRO, and I'm worried if I don't tell him in advance he's barred from attendance it would be less compelling to a judge. As a precaution, I am going to have my husband at the door who will know to watch for him and tell him to leave; I don't think an off-duty cop is necessary on top of that for now.

Thanks,
Lindsey

On Mon, Feb 6, 2017 at 8:43 AM, McCabe, David (CI-StPaul) <david.mccabe@ci.stpaul.mn.us> wrote:

Hi Lindsey, thank you for the details. I think they may be helpful.

Yes, I would like the emails you have received and the contact information for Chase and Kristina.

- I would advise removing the Tweet about Brock (if you haven't already). I see no known criminal violation, however it may help calm things down.
- For your event, I would be aware that he may show up. However, from everything I have seen from him, he has yet to confront anyone in person.
 - o Where is your event? When is your event?
 - o If he does show up I would call PD and have him trespassed, then seek an HRO against him.
 - o I would explore seeking an HRO against him regardless
 - o Tell me more about your event and I can weigh in more on an Off Duty cop.
- Keep monitoring your internet traffic, etc...From what I have seen Brock is pretty amateur, but it is hard to say.

I have several cases where Brock is the suspect. I have submitted numerous cases to the St Paul City Atty and Ramsey CO Atty. They have all been declined for "first amendment" reasons, and our weak criminal defamation law in MN. I have also contacted the FBI, but may explore some internet crimes task forces. If you have any thoughts on that I would be open to hearing them.

As I have told every victim, you have the option to file a civil suit against him. What city do you live in? At this point, filing a basic "info" report with the police might not be a bad idea.



Sergeant David McCabe

Sex Crimes Unit

Saint Paul Police Department
367 Grove Street
Saint Paul, MN 55101
Phone 651-266-5702
Fax 651-266-5529
david.mccabe@ci.stpaul.mn.us

From: Lindsey Middlecamp [mailto:lindsey.e.middlecamp@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2017 11:04 AM
To: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Cc: Catherine Schaefer
Subject: Brock Fredin follow up

Seargent McCabe,

I'm going to use my personal email address since this has nothing to do with my role with the City of Minneapolis but thanks for getting back to me a couple weeks back regarding Catherine Schaefer's case against Brock Fredin. Please note: as of now Brock does not know my personal information or last name and I intend to do what I can to keep it that way, so to the extent anything in my communications with you would lead you to make contact with him I'd like to discuss that first.

Anyway: I am writing to seek your input on security measures and keep you updated on Brock's recent activities which may not be grounds for prosecution at this stage but may help your efforts monitoring the broader context, and at least in my view, are escalating to an alarming degree:

Background info: I have only become acquainted with Catherine in connection with Brock's harassment, we don't have a preexisting relationship, nor have I ever met Brock. Some mutual acquaintances of Catherine's who know I maintain a women's issues and gendered violence-related personal twitter account put us in touch last summer to see if I could refer Catherine to an attorney and potentially raise awareness to her story to the extent Brock persisted in his harassment.

Dunn, Storme (CI-StPaul)

From: Falkowski, James (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Friday, April 28, 2017 8:25 AM
To: Iovino, Paul (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Fw: SPPD CN 16026382, Hudson PD Warrant
Attachments: SPPD CN 16026382 FREDIN House Warrant.pdf

From: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Friday, April 28, 2017 8:18 AM
To: Falkowski, James (CI-StPaul)
Subject: SPPD CN 16026382, Hudson PD Warrant

Ops plan Attached.



Sergeant David McCabe
Sex Crimes Unit & Mobile Field Force
Saint Paul Police Department
367 Grove Street
Saint Paul, MN 55101
Phone 651-266-5702
Fax 651-266-5529
david.mccabe@ci.stpaul.mn.us

Dunn, Storme (CI-StPaul)

From: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 11:18 AM
To: Vang, Yamy (CI-StPaul)
Subject: RE: Brock FREDIN Case

I believe that case was closed and unfounded, like all the others. I would need to conduct a search warrant for their information.

From: Vang, Yamy (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 11:05 AM
To: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Subject: RE: Brock FREDIN Case

Dave,

Based upon my initial review of the materials, I do not think we can charge him with anything since there was no direct contact with the victim. I'm carefully reviewing the materials again to see if that assessment is still valid and will get back to you. Do you have or have received a copy of the UPenn's response to his complaints against her? I understand that Victim has informed you that the Dept had called her in but what happened? Does she have anything in writing from them?

Yamy

From: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 8:41 AM
To: Vang, Yamy (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Brock FREDIN Case

Yamy, the victim is asking if we have a timeline on a decision. I am not trying to rush you, I know there is a lot of information. I am just seeing if there is something I can pass onto her.



Sergeant David McCabe
Sex Crimes Unit
Saint Paul Police Department
367 Grove Street
Saint Paul, MN 55101
Phone 651-266-5702
Fax 651-266-5529
david.mccabe@ci.stpaul.mn.us

Dunn, Storme (CI-StPaul)

From: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 8:41 AM
To: Vang, Yamy (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Brock FREDIN Case

Yamy, the victim is asking if we have a timeline on a decision. I am not trying to rush you, I know there is a lot of information. I am just seeing if there is something I can pass onto her.



Sergeant David McCabe

Sex Crimes Unit

Saint Paul Police Department

367 Grove Street

Saint Paul, MN 55101

Phone 651-266-5702

Fax 651-266-5529

david.mccabe@ci.stpaul.mn.us

Dunn, Storme (CI-StPaul)

From: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Thursday, February 23, 2017 11:56 AM
To: Patet, Tara (CI-StPaul)
Cc: Boyer, Amy (CI-StPaul);Lego, Joshua (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Fwd: Accused Minneapolis-St. Paul stalker Brock Fredin is writing a horror story, and he's the main character | City Pages

This is our guy! Its a good read. I can only imagine his response....

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: "Bree B" <ba@stpaulintervention.org>
Date: Thu, Feb 23, 2017 at 10:23 AM -0600
Subject: Accused Minneapolis-St. Paul stalker Brock Fredin is writing a horror story, and he's the main character | City Pages
To: "McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)" <david.mccabe@ci.stpaul.mn.us>

<http://www.citypages.com/news/accused-stalker-brock-fredin-is-writing-a-horror-story-and-hes-the-main-character/414395703>

Sent from my iPhone, please excuse any errors

Dunn, Storme (CI-StPaul)

Sent: Thursday, October 04, 2018 3:30 PM
To: Catherine Schaefer
Subject: RE: Brock Fredin harassment

Hi Catherine,

Please call for a squad to file an original report under a new case number and have them take a photo of the tweet. It appears that some of the tweet has been cut off you sent me. Once there is an original report an investigator will be assigned the case.

Please call the City Attorney's Office at (651) 266-8740 for further information on cases involving Brock Fredin as I didn't work on all the case that were filed and do not know about the cases filed in July

From: Catherine Schaefer <cschaefer@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 04, 2018 2:45 PM
To: Nasset, Sarah (CI-StPaul) <sarah.nasset@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: Re: Brock Fredin harassment

Hi Sgt Nasset,

I've been trying to reach you about another post of Brock's. Judge Diamond found these posts to be in violation of my restraining order as they are harassment and not protected speech. Please let me know how to file a report.

Additionally, I know his previous violations were referred for prosecution in July. Can you give me an update on their status, and let me know if they will be prosecuted?

Best,
Catherine

On Fri, Dec 15, 2017 at 10:15 AM Catherine Schaefer <cschaefer@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Officer Nasset,

Just following up on this- I will need a decline memo and I don't know how to get one. Abby said that they don't usually get them at SPIP, so please let me know.

Thanks,
Catherine

On Tue, Dec 5, 2017 at 11:46 AM, Nasset, Sarah (CI-StPaul) <sarah.nasset@ci.stpaul.mn.us> wrote:

Ms. Schaefer,

Thank you for the information and the video. I will add the information to the case file under case # 17-280176.

Sarah

<*))))>{



Sarah Nasset, Sergeant

Family Violence Unit

Saint Paul Police Department

367 Grove Street

Saint Paul, MN 55101

P: 651-266-5693

F: 651-266-5676

sarah.nasset@ci.stpaul.mn.us

Take our survey: <http://stpaul.gov/PoliceCommunitySurvey>

From: Catherine Schaefer [mailto:cschaefer@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, December 05, 2017 9:49 AM

To: Nasset, Sarah (CI-StPaul)

Subject: Brock Fredin harassment

Hi Officer Nasset,

The videos seem to be taking a very long time to upload so I wanted to make sure I didn't wait too long to email you. The most relevant part is at the end of the video posted on catherineschaefer.net at the bottom of the page. I will send along the captures of this and others when they're uploaded.

The case number for the texts in October is ci mp 17994112. It may be worth noting that the things I said in the texts are catering to a theory he has, and not the actual truth.

There's also a smattering of memes from April or May; those were sent to McCabe or Boyer.

Thanks and will follow up with video files soon.

Dunn, Storme (CI-StPaul)

From: Catherine Schaefer <cschaefer@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 04, 2018 2:45 PM
To: Nasset, Sarah (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Re: Brock Fredin harassment
Attachments: TwitterScchaefer25Sep18.png

Hi Sgt Nasset,

I've been trying to reach you about another post of Brock's. Judge Diamond found these posts to be in violation of my restraining order as they are harassment and not protected speech. Please let me know how to file a report.

Additionally, I know his previous violations were referred for prosecution in July. Can you give me an update on their status, and let me know if they will be prosecuted?

Best,
Catherine

On Fri, Dec 15, 2017 at 10:15 AM Catherine Schaefer <cschaefer@gmail.com> wrote:
Hi Officer Nasset,

Just following up on this- I will need a decline memo and I don't know how to get one. Abby said that they don't usually get them at SPIP, so please let me know.

Thanks,
Catherine

On Tue, Dec 5, 2017 at 11:46 AM, Nasset, Sarah (CI-StPaul) <sarah.nasset@ci.stpaul.mn.us> wrote:

Ms. Schaefer,

Thank you for the information and the video. I will add the information to the case file under case # 17-280176.

Sarah

<*>>{



Sarah Nasset, Sergeant

Family Violence Unit

Saint Paul Police Department

367 Grove Street

Saint Paul, MN 55101

P: 651-266-5693

F: 651-266-5676

sarah.nasset@ci.stpaul.mn.us

Take our survey: <http://stpaul.gov/PoliceCommunitySurvey>

From: Catherine Schaefer [mailto:cschaefer@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, December 05, 2017 9:49 AM

To: Nasset, Sarah (CI-StPaul)

Subject: Brock Fredin harassment

Hi Officer Nasset,

The videos seem to be taking a very long time to upload so I wanted to make sure I didn't wait too long to email you. The most relevant part is at the end of the video posted on catherineschaefer.net at the bottom of the page. I will send along the captures of this and others when they're uploaded.

The case number for the texts in October is ci mp 17994112. It may be worth noting that the things I said in the texts are catering to a theory he has, and not the actual truth.

There's also a smattering of memes from April or May; those were sent to McCabe or Boyer.

Thanks and will follow up with video files soon.

Catherine

Dunn, Storme (CI-StPaul)

From: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2017 8:43 AM
To: Lindsey Middlecamp
Subject: RE: Brock Fredin follow up

Hi Lindsey, thank you for the details. I think they may be helpful.

Yes, I would like the emails you have received and the contact information for Chase and Kristina.

- I would advise removing the Tweet about Brock (if you haven't already). I see no known criminal violation, however it may help calm things down.
- For your event, I would be aware that he may show up. However, from everything I have seen from him, he has yet to confront anyone in person.
 - o Where is your event? When is your event?
 - o If he does show up I would call PD and have him trespass, then seek an HRO against him.
 - o I would explore seeking an HRO against him regardless
 - o Tell me more about your event and I can weigh in more on an Off Duty cop.
- Keep monitoring your internet traffic, etc...From what I have seen Brock is pretty amateur, but it is hard to say.

I have several cases where Brock is the suspect. I have submitted numerous cases to the St Paul City Atty and Ramsey CO Atty. They have all been declined for "first amendment" reasons, and our weak criminal defamation law in MN. I have also contacted the FBI, but may explore some internet crimes task forces. If you have any thoughts on that I would be open to hearing them.

As I have told every victim, you have the option to file a civil suit against him. What city do you live in? At this point, filing a basic "info" report with the police might not be a bad idea.



Sergeant David McCabe
Sex Crimes Unit
Saint Paul Police Department
367 Grove Street
Saint Paul, MN 55101
Phone 651-266-5702
Fax 651-266-5529
david.mccabe@ci.stpaul.mn.us

From: Lindsey Middlecamp [mailto:lindsey.e.middlecamp@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2017 11:04 AM
To: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Cc: Catherine Schaefer
Subject: Brock Fredin follow up

Seargent McCabe,

I'm going to use my personal email address since this has nothing to do with my role with the City of Minneapolis but thanks for getting back to me a couple weeks back regarding Catherine Schaefer's case against Brock Fredin. Please note: as of now Brock does not know my personal information or last name and I intend to do what I can to keep it that way, so to the extent anything in my communications with you would lead you to make contact with him I'd like to discuss that first.

Anyway: I am writing to seek your input on security measures and keep you updated on Brock's recent activities which may not be grounds for prosecution at this stage but may help your efforts monitoring the broader context, and at least in my view, are escalating to an alarming degree:

Background info: I have only become acquainted with Catherine in connection with Brock's harassment, we don't have a preexisting relationship, nor have I ever met Brock. Some mutual acquaintances of Catherine's who know I maintain a women's issues and gendered violence-related personal twitter account put us in touch last summer to see if I could refer Catherine to an attorney and potentially raise awareness to her story to the extent Brock persisted in his harassment.

Several weeks ago, when the January Court of Appeals decision in Grace Miller's case was issued, I recognized the name and was glad to see at least one restraining order against him had been upheld. I contacted Catherine to see how her case had resolved and she indicated she too had gotten her restraining order against him.

On January 24, 2017 I posted a tweet that told my followers Brock Fredin is a local man with two restraining orders against him. I did not "tag" or direct the tweet to Brock's attention and as far as I could tell from limited searching, he had deleted his twitter account long ago.

However, he must have seen my tweet, which I surmise based on the following retaliatory steps he has taken, which seem to have begun yesterday and continue to escalate today:

1. Yesterday at 5 AM he emailed a writer for the Huffington Post who, a year or so ago, had written a nice article about my women's issues twitter account. He asked the HuffPo writer to please identify my last name (since it is not disclosed in the article or on twitter) so he could report it to the St. Paul police in connection with revenge porn and harassment by "stalker" Catherine Schaefer and I. The Huffington Post author did not respond, and merely forwarded the email to me. I wrote to Brock a neutral, very legal-voiced email simply saying please do not contact me or any third parties about me again as attempts to track me down is threatening and unwanted.
2. A local man named Chase (not an acquaintance of mine) had liked my tweet (apologies if you're familiar with Twitter and I'm over-explaining, but on that format any person can see the list of users/accounts that have "liked" or re-tweeted a post) received word yesterday both from his former and current employer that they had gotten alarming emails similar to the one the Huffington Post received about me, accusing Chase of criminal conduct.
3. Separate from these emails, his current employer also received a phone call yesterday from Brock raising the same allegations. The employer at that time was unwilling to forward the emails they'd received as they didn't want to get involved in any controversy. Note: Chase's employers are not listed on twitter so this required some digging by Brock.
4. Another local woman, Kristina (again, not an acquaintance of mine, though we are now in touch; her only connection is pressing the "like" button and showing up on a list) received word yesterday that the Pioneer Press got an email similar to the others insisting the Pioneer Press delete its nice write-up about Kristina due to her connection with revenge porn and harassment of him. She forwarded that to me.

5. In addition to that email, Kristina's current employer, Redbrick Health, received a live phone call today from Brock repeating these allegations, ostensibly hoping to have her disciplined or penalized in some way. Kristina has expressed to me that she is scared of escalation because she lives alone and finds this tracking down of her threatening.

I can provide you with contact information for Chase and Kristina if you need any additional info. I can also forward you the emails from Brock that have been forwarded to me.

My security question other than doing what I can to scrub the Internet of any identifying information/avenues to me is: I am facilitating a rape survivor event next Wednesday night that I'm advertising on Twitter. In your opinion, is Brock's m.o. of the nature you'd be nervous he will attend to either cause problems or find me, and if so, would you view it as worthwhile for me to hire an off-duty plains clothes officer presence at the door?

Thanks and let me know if a phone call this afternoon would be helpful on any of these issues,
Lindsey

Dunn, Storme (CI-StPaul)

From: Grace Miller <mill6531@umn.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 10:56 AM
To: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Re: Court
Attachments: COA Opinion.pdf

This epic burn is what came down from court yesterday.

On Tue, Jan 24, 2017 at 7:42 PM, McCabe, David (CI-StPaul) <david.mccabe@ci.stpaul.mn.us> wrote:

From: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 10:39 AM
To: Grace Miller (mill6531@umn.edu)
Subject: Court

So what came down from court yesterday?

Sergeant David McCabe

Sex Crimes Unit



Saint Paul Police Department
367 Grove Street
Saint Paul, MN 55101
Phone [651-266-5702](tel:651-266-5702)
Fax [651-266-5529](tel:651-266-5529)
david.mccabe@ci.stpaul.mn.us

Dunn, Storme (CI-StPaul)

From: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 10:38 AM
To: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Subject: RE: Brock Fredin

Can you send me Grace's appeals decision please? That was my case too :/

From: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 10:33 AM
To: 'lindsey.middlecamp@minneapolismn.gov'
Subject: Brock Fredin

Hi Lindsey, I saw your email to Mary Heng, then to Tara Patet. I have been working on this case for several years now and so far everything I have submitted has been declined.



Sergeant David McCabe

Sex Crimes Unit

Saint Paul Police Department

367 Grove Street

Saint Paul, MN 55101

Phone 651-266-5702

Fax 651-266-5529

david.mccabe@ci.stpaul.mn.us

Dunn, Storme (CI-StPaul)

From: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 10:39 AM
To: lindsey.middlecamp@minneapolismn.gov
Subject: RE: Brock Fredin

Can you send me the appeals court link to Grace's case. That was mine too.

From: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 10:33 AM
To: 'lindsey.middlecamp@minneapolismn.gov'
Subject: Brock Fredin

Hi Lindsey, I saw your email to Mary Heng, then to Tara Patet. I have been working on this case for several years now and so far everything I have submitted has been declined.



Sergeant David McCabe

Sex Crimes Unit

Saint Paul Police Department
367 Grove Street
Saint Paul, MN 55101
Phone 651-266-5702
Fax 651-266-5529
david.mccabe@ci.stpaul.mn.us

Dunn, Storme (CI-StPaul)

From: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 10:33 AM
To: lindsey.middlecamp@minneapolismn.gov
Subject: Brock Fredin

Hi Lindsey, I saw your email to Mary Heng, then to Tara Patet. I have been working on this case for several years now and so far everything I have submitted has been declined.



Sergeant David McCabe
Sex Crimes Unit
Saint Paul Police Department
367 Grove Street
Saint Paul, MN 55101
Phone 651-266-5702
Fax 651-266-5529
david.mccabe@ci.stpaul.mn.us

I suspect they will file for a court order at this Friday's hearing, and he has trial on 7/17. I just want to give the prosecutor a heads up.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 5, 2017, at 11:00 AM, Siegfried, Adam (CI-StPaul) <adam.siegfried@ci.stpaul.mn.us> wrote:

Dave,

I am leaving for training in AL this Friday and be back the 25th. So far I am have way through and nothing regarding the aforementioned victims. I am still locked out of his laptop.

Adam

From: McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Wednesday, July 05, 2017 10:08 AM
To: Keating, John (CI-StPaul); Siegfried, Adam (CI-StPaul)
Cc: Boyer, Amy (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Fwd: Brock Fredin -- Property

Adam, read the emails below so you are caught up.

Just to clarify/remind; the search of his devices is for data related to the stalking of GRACE MILLER. Should you find any data related to Catherine Schaefer or any other potential victim let us know and we can write a new warrant.

We are waiting to hear back from Steve Christie, but if you have any ?s let me know. I am out of town until SAT, but have my phone and have been checking email.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "McCabe, David (CI-StPaul)" <david.mccabe@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Date: July 4, 2017 at 3:14:15 PM CDT
To: "Christie, Steve (CI-StPaul)" <steve.christie@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Cc: "Boyer, Amy (CI-StPaul)" <amy.boyer@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: Re: Brock Fredin -- Property

Steve, can you please advise Sgt Boyer and I how you would like to proceed with this request. The forensic exam is still underway.

The warrant for those devices was written under the probable cause of the crimes for which Fredin was charged (your case) and not any of the other cases (since there was no PC to charge, per SPCA Vang).

The forensic team was instructed that if something was found outside of the scope of the charged case which could be evidence in the other ones, that they should let us know so we could write a second warrant.

We are happy to do whatever you wish.